

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 93 16:39:02 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #235
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 16 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 235

Today's Topics:

 Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer (3 msgs)
 Call sign snobbery (2 msgs)
Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (2 msgs)
 Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
 machine-generated CW [LONG LONG]

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 16 Jul 93 19:49:47 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!linac!newsaintmail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22613eINNatt@west.West.Sun.COM>, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

[stuff deleted]

> First, the system is a Burroughs something-or-other. The database
> records were stored in 300 byte fixed length (EBCDIC) records, fully two
> thirds of which was completely blank. Secondly, the inter-agency
> charge between the NTIS and the FCC was \$530 to make the TWO half
> inch/9track 6250BPI tapes, which worked out to about \$15 per MINUTE
> according to the amount of CPU time used. Bear in mind that the
> total amount of data we're talking about here is about 55 Megabytes.
> The end price for the tapes, delivered to me from the NTIS was \$720.

[stuff deleted]

```
> I'm sure that many of us would gladly help pay for a new FCC computer
> to help defray these costs.  $20 per license application would easily
> foot the bill for a nice 486DX2 66mhz with a 500 MB drive and 8
> megabytes of RAM.  A nice unix workstation could run circles around
> the Burroughs for about $10,000.
```

You don't have enough facts to be making recommendations.

While your proposal may very well handle the database, you're completely ignoring many other aspects of why a large system might be used.

If such a database were put on a PC, only *one* person at a time could maintain it. Even if a network were used, the number of simultaneous accesses is fairly small. That computer is probably used for many other things as well, and probably has nationwide, if not worldwide access. You can't do that with a PC.

PCs are **NOT** the answer to everything. In fact, they're not the answer to most things. There are things they're good at; I don't think the FCC callsign database is one of them.

```
> [ Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ                                Fred.Lloyd@west.sun.com ]
> [ Sun Microsystems,                                Systems Engineer ]
> [ Phoenix, AZ                                       (602) 224-3517 ]
```

```
=====
[ Mark E. Levy, N9RXF                               |                               ]
[ BitNet:      LEVY@FNAL                             | Unix is to computing                     ]
[ Internet: LEVY@FNAL.GOV                            |      as an Etch-a-Sketch is to art.     ]
[ HEPnet/SPAN: FNALD::LEVY (VMS!)                   |                               ]
=====
```

Date: 16 Jul 1993 16:30:38 GMT
From: korie!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@ames.arpa
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Some may wonder why the FCC does not reissue old callsigns. For whatever reason they stopped doing it, the reason today is that government is too big, too bloated, and too wrapped up in 1960's technology, policies and procedures. Putting it bluntly, granting user requested callsigns would result in more work for them.

A few months back when I purchased their database, I received a sheet

from their computer department which detailed the database format along with the type of system and per-minute charges.

So the story goes something like this:

First, the system is a Burroughs something-or-other. The database records were stored in 300 byte fixed length (EBCDIC) records, fully two thirds of which was completely blank. Secondly, the inter-agency charge between the NTIS and the FCC was \$530 to make the TWO half inch/9track 6250BPI tapes, which worked out to about \$15 per MINUTE according to the amount of CPU time used. Bear in mind that the total amount of data we're talking about here is about 55 Megabytes. The end price for the tapes, delivered to me from the NTIS was \$720.

Yes, a great many of us reading this could do a better job of amateur callsign database management on a PC for less money than they pay for maintenance on the big Burroughs, saving them a bundle. Meanwhile, however, the government is preparing to raise our taxes to help pay for this steaming heap of 1960's technology, along with a trillion other pork barrel expenditures.

I'm sure that many of us would gladly help pay for a new FCC computer to help defray these costs. \$20 per license application would easily foot the bill for a nice 486DX2 66mhz with a 500 MB drive and 8 megabytes of RAM. A nice unix workstation could run circles around the Burroughs for about \$10,000.

It isn't going to happen, however, because they use this same steam-driven monolith for their commercial licenses, as well as all other frequency allocation databases. Yes, it's big, probably on the order of 5 to 10 gigabytes total.

What's more likely to happen is that they eventually throw up their arms and hand out all amateur radio matters to another body, perhaps the VEC system or the ARRL. They've already demonstrated that amateur radio is a net burden to them and that their number one priority is cutting their costs and responsibilities, not expanding them.

What we should do as a community is offer to help them, approaching any problem from the standpoint of reducing their workload. If we can demonstrate that some other method would cost them nothing, reduce their workload and make them more productive, they might just bite.

On the other hand, petitioning them for more service (e.g. custom callsigns) is a guaranteed road to nowhere.

[Sun Microsystems,
[Phoenix, AZ

Systems Engineer]
(602) 224-3517]

Date: 16 Jul 1993 15:17:20 -0700

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!ornews.intel.com!ornews.intel.com!not-
for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CA9su2.n3H@eis.calstate.edu> jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon)
writes:

>

>Maybe if all the hams would pay a annual licensing fee...

Just to keep some balance here, this is one ham who thinks he is paying
enough taxes and government fees. I had to pay \$8 for my first ham ticket
in 68' but back then I could visit the national forests and parks for free.
User fees are being added to everything these days while the income tax
has not gone down dramatically. Out here in Oregon you can bet there will
be no sales tax despite its constant reappearance on the ballot. These
folks know we can get along fine with less government in our face.
All you are going to get if you pay for more government is... more
government.

--

WA7LDV zardo@ornews.intel.com

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 12:49:04 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!
news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@ames.arpa

Subject: Call sign snobbery

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <224t5l\$fb1@hp-col.col.hp.com>, bobw@col.hp.com (Bob Witte) writes:

> As time went on, people figured
> out that there were some newfangled calls on the bands and that
> these WD9 calls were clearly newly licensed folks. Now if you
> have a WD9 call, you are pretty much an oldtimer. (Well, OK, not that
> old but it puts you in the been licensed >10 years catagory.)
>
> I seem to recall some older radio amateurs describing the same

> phenomenon when the 1x3 calls beginning with K were first instituted.
>
> So the bottom line is someday your 1x3 N call will mark you as
> a veteran radio op. But you have to wait a while. And in the mean
> time you have to put up with some crap from a small narrow-minded
> segment of the amateur population.
>

Exactly!! My father, K0SVY, used to hate his 1x3 K call because it wasn't as distinguished as his father's 1x3 W call (W0KAY--originally W9KAY before the forming of the 10th District). He commented that the first time he felt otherwise was when a guy he works with (KS0KU) said he wished *he* had one of the old 1x3 K calls. Right now, I'm glad I got a 1x3 N call, as it has always seemed to me to be the correct type of call--1x3.

--
Will Turner, N0RDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: 16 Jul 93 17:35:50 EDT
From: pacbell.com!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!
psinntp!arrrl.org@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu (Joe Reid) writes:
>>> phenomenon when the 1x3 calls beginning with K were first instituted.
>>>
>
>I'll admit I'm very new at this (I passed 2 and I'm taking 3a and 1a tonite)
>but I can't figure out the "definition" of 1x3 or so forth callsign. Would
>someone please post an explanation for me, thanks.

>
> Joe Reid
>
>--
>Joe Reid
>jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu jreid@gnu.ai.mit.edu
>rrr!jreid@vtserf.cc.vt.edu vpcjoe@vtcs1.cs.vt.edu
>UNIX Systems Administrator, pool player, and professional do-nothing
>

W1AW -- 1 X 2 call (_1_ letter, the district number, then _2_ letters)
W1INF -- 1 X 3

WA1WVK -- 2 X 3
KB1BE -- 2 X 2
KR1S -- 2 X 1

The first calls issued in the US were a number and 3 letters: 2IHO. When communication between countries became possible, prefixes were needed to differentiate between countries. Until these prefixes were allocated, many American hams used the unofficial prefix U. 1 X 2 and 1 X 3 calls starting with W are the oldest callsign group currently in use.

In the 70s, eligible hams could buy 1 X 2 calls starting with W or K, and later N. That's where most of today's 1 X 2 calls come from. There are a few old timers with original 1 X 2 calls still with us. 1 X 2 calls became known as "preferred calls." Contesters and DXers especially liked them, as they took less time to send. There was also a prestige value. If you had one, you'd been a ham for a while and had an Extra Class license for a while.

Starting in the late 50s, when the original batch of 1 X 3 W/K calls ran out, FCC began issuing 2 X 3 calls, starting with WA, then going to WB. They skipped WC for amateur calls, then started issuing WD calls.

When all the 1 X 2s were issued (to Extras) in a district, FCC began issuing 2 X 1 calls. I believe the separate calls for license class system started about the same time. Until then, the only way you could modify your call (without moving--back then your number was supposed to match the district where your station license was listed) was to get an Extra Class license. Until the 1 X 3 N-prefix calls started running out, followed by the 2 X 1 prefixes, there was a different callsign group for every class!

Back when everyone had a real suffix, it was common to refer to someone by his or her suffix: "LZedN said EDW bought a new receiver last week." You also didn't need a two-acre dupe sheet for Sweepstakes in those days, either, but that's for another day.

73,

Jim, KR1S

--

jkearman@arrl.org

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 18:10:13 GMT
From: psinntp!laidbak!tellab5!cuuxb!ncrlis1!ncrh2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930713.201327.2u4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>
>Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is
>constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and
>implemented by said agency. Secondly, the ARRL at my last accounting,
>only represents, or says the represent 120k- amateurs in the United
>States. And if you look at QST from a few years back, you'll see that
>the ARRL went AGAINST the membership in supporting the no-code license.
>Why is this? And please, don't use the argument of saving bandwidth. It
>wasn't that. How much money does the ARRL make everytime they sell my
>name to yet another distributor, or merchant? Hmmm... makes you wonder.
>

The Cynic speaks. So what if they sell your name to merchants? Don't
you benefit from some of the catalogs arriving in your mailbox? I do.
And don't you think that other organizations besides the ARRL distribute
your address once they find out you're a ham? I receive catalogs in the
mail with *different* address labels on them, so I know there's more than
one source.

As far as the FCC implementing the ARRL's opinions, that's hogwash. The
ARRL is just one of many organizations speaking to the FCC, and the bottom
line is, the FCC does what it thinks best, not what the ARRL thinks best.
If there are other amateur organizations which should have more clout than
ARRL due to larger memberships, I'm sure that will happen in time. But
for many many years the ARRL was *the* national amateur organization. I
am not sure if they still are, but the FCC still recognizes them as such.
Bureaucratic inertia keeps it this way. Don't insinuate that the
relationship between ARRL and FCC is anything more, they are most certainly
not in bed together.

>
>The other thing that bothers me about the ARRL is they constantly stick
>their nose into things they have no bearing upon. For instance, the
>broadcast radio obscenity hearings are a good example.
>

But this does have a potential effect on enforcement of amateur regulations.
Don't get me wrong, I don't agree with ARRL's position on this. But since
I'm not a member I can't complain ;-)

>But, far be it from me to criticize the all mighty and powerful ARRL.
>The only reason myself and many of my friends are members is beacuse of
>QST and even thats getting pretty sickening.

If that's the only reason, why don't you just buy the QSTs from the store
or get the used ones from your club's periodical table? If I were as
anti-ARRL as you are I would pay extra to avoid being a member.

--

[] [] [] []	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] []	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[] [] [] []	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[] [] [] []		
[] [] [] []	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

Date: 16 Jul 93 10:08:29 EDT
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>>>Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is
>>>constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and
>>>implemented by said agency.

>> I certainly hope so. Can I infer from your statement that if all of our
>> opinions were rejected by the FCC you would be heaping praise upon us?

>I don't think so. It's just that the influence seems pretty suspect at
>times.

I am not real sure in what way our influence is "suspect." We do indeed
try to effect our influence on the FCC, to the best of our ability according
to the way we (primarily through the Board of Directors) percieve the
wishes of our members. Now, especially if we have taken some action with
the FCC with which you disagree, you probably could point out some flaws
in the processes with which we determine the pulse of our members, but
that process can be difficult at best, impossible at worst. Many of the
burning regulatory issues of Amateur Radio are fast-paced, leaving
little time for large surveys and the like. Our staff, and Division
Directors are available by mail, email, telephone and in-person at
many hamfests and ARRL Conventions. The OPPORTUNITY to influence our

policy makers is there; you would be surprised how few hams take advantage of that opportunity.

>It's not so much that I mind, I just wonder what exactly the connection
>is. Are the ARRL's financial records public? I'd be interested in seeing
>where it all goes.

We do publish an annual report, available for \$1.00 from ARRL HQ. Also, most of the info from the report is published in the May QST.

>Contact our section manager? Are you kidding? The guy is never around.
>He was supposed to speak at a meeting of the Ocean State Amateur Radio
>Group the other night.. never showed. Additionally, there was no entry
>for section news in Rhode Island in the last issue of QST.

The Section Manager is an elected volunteer position. The disadvantage to volunteers is that they are volunteers. The advantage to an elected position is that you can run against him in the next election, or, if you are not happy with his performance, you can vote against him. Some of the SMs are great; others mediocre and a few are lousy. Remember, the SM is the point of contact for *local* ARRL matters. The Directors are the policy makers, and the HQ staff is paid to support Directors, the Field Organization and the members.

I am sorry to hear that the club meeting was missed. There may (or may not) have been a valid reason. I suggest that you check, and sympathize if there was, complain if there was not. RI is not too far away; if you would like I will be glad to drive to one of your club meetings and give you a technical presentation of EMI/RFI, antennas or ARRL Product Review testing. I will supply the slide projector; you supply the screen and a cup of coffee (the honorarium).

>It seems that too much of QST is related to contesting and
>advertisements. I realize it does cost money to print a publication the
>size of QST but there must be something better.

Well, the advertising is a part of QST that both helps pay for its way, and is considered by many to be an important part of a technical magazine. For example, when I am in the market for a new computer gizwhompus I always buy a Computer Shopper just for the ads. Your point about contesting is under heavy consideration. We are presently undergoing an intensive self-examination, looking at things ranging from the content of QST to the nature of membership services (both in terms of quality control and content). There could not be a better time to suggest positive changes to the organization!

>> Thanks for your input, Tony. I will send you our list of HQ
>> email addresses (file: ARRL-EMAIL-ADR on info@arrl.org). That will

>> help you communicate a bit more directly.

>Hmmm.. that would be interesting. Is your available via FTP yet?

We are waiting for our Internet service (PSI) to get a more complete Internet service available in Hartford. When it is available, we will indeed have "full-duplex" ftp capability. In the meantime, we do have many ARRL files available from the mail server, info@arrl.org, and our land-line BBS (203) 666-0578. I encourage you to use both and take a look around.

In the meantime, please do communicate! The ARRL staff is here and available (if somewhat overworked :-). As a friend of mine once pointed out; One will never put the puzzle together by leaving all of the pieces in the box.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"The goal of every engineer is to
retire without getting blamed for a
major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams
and Dilbert

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 20:56:07 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-
feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!sctc.com!curry@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>moisan@bronze.lcs.mit.edu (David Moisan) writes:

>> According to Michael, ham radio's not for young people without
>>the ability to pay for kilobuck equipment?

>The push to get the no-code license passed was not to swell the ranks
>"to protect bandwidth" (most no-coders live on 2mtrs), but rather to

>increase the ranks so more V/UHF equipment could be sold, and higher
>advertising rates could be charged in QST.

Well, I really like the idea, mainly because it gives me the chance to pick up a Ham Radio to take rock-climbing with me in the event of an emergency, which is the number ONE reason I became interested in Ham.

I didn't have to spend a lot of time memorizing code that I undoubtedly won't be using until I make the decision to get into Ham Radio "seriously". That was nice, at any rate, to be able to take a short simple test, in my mind it provides a nice 'barrier' (i.e you have to study a little bit and you have to actually take the time to test..) to keep out a majority of the scumbag types you run into on CB, but it doesn't require you to be a total life-consuming electronics geek.

Don't get me wrong on the "geek" bit, I've been a computer geek for many years and am starting to get very interested in electronics, however, I would NEVER think that someone should be an expert in computers before being allowed to have one. Somewhere along the line, that seems to be the thing people hack on the no-code license for, as if you are supposed to be a total radio freak BEFORE you even have a chance to get started in it.

At any rate, I would be VERY INTERESTED "Reverend" if you would supply the proof behind your statement that the no-code license is to increase advertising rates in QST.

(Not that I don't believe it, Its just that
I was sure the Illuminati were behind it all..)

Sincerely,

Russ. (curry@sctc.com)

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 21:52:31 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!goedux.enet.dec.com!jepson_st@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: machine-generated CW [LONG LONG]
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>A common practice among CW ops was to add a little flourish at the
>very end of a contact:
>
>"dit dit di-dit dit"

>or
>"dit di-di-di dit dit"
>
>Which was replied to with a "dit dit" followed by the reverse exchange.
>Sorta like dapping or "giving five". Keyboard whackers cannot participate
>in this exchange of course, since they only have one kind of "dit".
>Paddle pushers can't do it either as far as I know, having never tried
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Not true, I use the 'shave and a haircut, 6 bits' technique all the time
with my good old Heath Miro-matic and Brown Brothers Paddles. I have a
straight key hooked up too. I case I need to get really creative.

Steve...AI7W

Date: 16 Jul 1993 11:01:59 -0400
From: vtserf.cc.vt.edu!csugrad.cs.vt.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul15.172451.28970@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <224t51\$fb1@hp-
col.col.hp.com>, <1993Jul16.074904@iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

>> phonomenon when the 1x3 calls beginning with K were first instituted.
>>

I'll admint I'm very new at this (I passed 2 and I'm taking 3a and 1a tonite)
but I can't figure out the "definition" of 1x3 or so forth callsign. Would
someone please post an explanation for me, thanks.

Joe Reid

--
Joe Reid
jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu jreid@gnu.ai.mit.edu
rri!jreid@vtserf.cc.vt.edu vpcjoe@vtcs1.cs.vt.edu
UNIX Systems Administrator, pool player, and professional do-nothing

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 16:11:47 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <224t51\$fb1@hp-col.col.hp.com>, <1993Jul16.074904@iastate.edu>,

<226ft7\$kb@csugrad.cs.vt.edu>odoh
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <226ft7\$kb@csugrad.cs.vt.edu>, jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu (Joe Reid)
writes:

|> >> phenomenon when the 1x3 calls beginning with K were first instituted.

|> >>

|>

|> I'll admit I'm very new at this (I passed 2 and I'm taking 3a and 1a tonite)

|> but I can't figure out the "definition" of 1x3 or so forth callsign. Would

|> someone please post an explanation for me, thanks.

|>

|> Joe Reid

|>

|> --

|> Joe Reid

|> jreid@csugrad.cs.vt.edu

jreid@gnu.ai.mit.edu

|> rri!jreid@vtserf.cc.vt.edu

vpcjoe@vtcs1.cs.vt.edu

|> UNIX Systems Administrator, pool player, and professional do-nothing

--

The first number refers to the number of letters preceding the single number
and the second number refers to the number of letters following the single
number;

1x3 N2XYZ

1x2 N2AB

2x3 NN3DFI

The 1xanything calls are becoming scarce in some areas...

++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOX?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+

+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P

+

++++++

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #235
